

## REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 15-17, 19, 23, and 25 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The examiner is thanked for performing a thorough search.

The Examiner is thanked for allowing Claims 2-4, 6, 10-12, 14, 18-20, 22, and 23 provided they are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### 102 Rejections

#### Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 13, 15-17, 21 and 24

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 13, 15-17, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0101367 by Bartfai et al. (referred to hereinafter as "Bartfai"). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments recited by the amended independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are neither taught nor suggested by Bartfai.

Applicants agree with the Office Action's statement that Bartfai does not teach or suggest "setting a link usage indicator in a first storage element by reach of said communicating nodes prior to communication therebetween, and wherein each of said communicating nodes has a corresponding position in said first storage element, and wherein said link usage indicator set by each of said nodes is relative to said corresponding position in said first storage element." The independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended to recite "setting a link usage indicator in a first storage element by reach of said communicating nodes prior to communication therebetween, and wherein each of said communicating nodes has a corresponding position in said first storage element, and wherein said link usage indicator set by each of said nodes is relative to said corresponding position in said first storage element."

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are patentable over Bartfai. Claims 3-8 depend on Claim 1, Claims 11-16 depend on Claim 9, Claims 19-24 depend on Claim 17 and include all of the limitations of the respective independent Claims 1, 9 and 17. Therefore Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent Claims are patentable for at least the reasons that the respective independent Claims are patentable.

Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 13, 15-17, 21 and 24

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 13, 15-17, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0018926 by Chen (referred to hereinafter as "Chen"). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments recited by the amended independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are neither taught nor suggested by Chen.

Applicants agree with the Office Action's statement that Chen does not teach or suggest "setting a link usage indicator in a first storage element by reach of said communicating nodes prior to communication therebetween, and wherein each of said communicating nodes has a corresponding position in said first storage element, and wherein said link usage indicator set by each of said nodes is relative to said corresponding position in said first storage element." The independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended to recite "setting a link usage indicator in a first storage element by reach of said communicating nodes prior to communication therebetween, and wherein each of said communicating nodes has a corresponding position in said first storage element, and wherein said link usage indicator set by each of said nodes is relative to said corresponding position in said first storage element."

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are patentable over Chen. Claims 3-8 depend on Claim 1, Claims 11-16 depend on Claim 9, Claims 19-24 depend on Claim 17 and include all of the limitations of the respective independent Claims 1, 9 and 17. Therefore Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent Claims are patentable for at least the reasons that the respective independent Claims are patentable.

Conclusions


In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-24 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 5/22/06

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Wagner  
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060